

REMARKS

Claims 62-65 were previously pending. Claim 63 is canceled herein. New claims 66-69 are added herein. Therefore, claims 62, 64-69 are submitted for consideration herein.

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claim 62 (and its dependent claims) under 35 U.S.C. 112(1) because the examiner could not find support for the feature in claim 62 reciting, "the random determination made independent of any cards displayed."

The Applicant respectfully points to paragraph 118, which states in part, "A player by default will receive one draw after the initial deal. However, if the player is dealt the "double draw card" (either on the initial deal or on the first draw), then the player will be entitled to a second draw. The double draw card should be indicated in any way, such as being shown but then replaced by the next card in the deck so game play proceeds normally. Alternatively, instead of using a double draw card, the double draw can be triggered at random using a predetermined probability." (emphasis added).

Thus, according to the above language, in this embodiment, whether the player receives the double draw is not related to the values of the other cards dealt. Therefore, withdrawal of the 112(1) rejection is respectfully requested.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 62-65 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carrico in view of Perrie.

More particularly, with regard to what was previously claim 63 item 9(h). on Page 4 states that Perrie teaches, "Using a special card (double draw card), to represent the beginning of the second draw feature, (Col. 12:51-53).

The applicant respectfully disagrees, as the cited portion of Perrie teaches initiating a bonus round when a particular symbol(s) appears on a reeled slot machine. This is different than dealing a special card in a hand of cards.

Prior claim 63 is now canceled and its features have been amended into claim 62.

Therefore, the combination of the applied references does not each or suggest the features of what is now amended claim 62, and it is submitted that claim 62 is patentable over the applied references.

Furthermore, claim 64 recites, “providing a virtual deck of a standard 52 card deck with a 53rd double draw card added, wherein all cards dealt to the player are dealt from the virtual deck.” The rejection does not state any reference which teaches or suggests using a special deck of cards which has an additional card which triggers a double draw, as claimed.

Therefore, the combination of the applied references does not teach or suggest the features of claim 64,

Moreover, new claims 66-69 recite additional embodiments not previously claimed. Support for these new claims can be found in the Specification, paragraphs 102-117, and figures 8-13. Additionally support for features in these claims can also be found throughout the specification and figures as well, and the applicant does not limit support for such claims to the cited portions of the specification.

If there are any issues the Examiner wishes to discuss with the Applicant, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Muskin & Cusick

By /Jon H. Muskin #43,824/

Jon. H. Muskin
Reg. No. 43,824
Customer # 43,536
Tel (215) 853-8257